

Energy of the vacuum with a perfectly conducting and infinite cylindrical surface

Peter Gosdzinsky^a and August Romeo^b

^a *Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and IFAE, Edifici Cn, E-08193 Bellaterra*

^b *IEEC (Institut d'Estudis Espacials de Catalunya), CSIC Research Unit, Edifici Nexus, 204, c. Gran Capità 2-4, E-08034 Barcelona*

Abstract. Values for the vacuum energy of scalar fields under Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions on an infinite cylindrical surface are found, and they happen to be of opposite signs. In contrast with classical works, a complete zeta function regularization scheme is here applied. These fields are regarded as interesting both by themselves and as the key to describing the electromagnetic (e.m.) case. With their help, the figure for the e.m. Casimir effect in the presence of this surface, found by De Raad and Milton, is now confirmed.

PACS: 03.70.+k, 12.20.-m, 42.50.Lc

Introduction. The Casimir effect [1] is caused by zero-point fluctuations of quantum fields in the vacuum when they are modified by the introduction of boundaries or constraints. The particular features of the resulting force depend on the nature of the field, boundaries and boundary conditions (b.c.) imposed (in some cases, an interpretation in terms of the radiation pressure [2] has been made). It arises in different areas of physics, including quantum electrodynamics, theory of hadrons, and cosmology. Further, there has been a series of attempts to explain the phenomenon of sonoluminescence on the basis of the Casimir effect, which, although unsuccessful (see [3] and refs. therein) still gives an idea of the importance attributed to its role in modern physics.

Evaluating the zero-point energy is usually an involved problem, and a great deal of techniques have been thought up for this purpose. Some reasons have made of zeta function regularization[4]-[8] a relatively popular method. Particularly, the variant we employ in this paper has similarities with the technique developed in ref.[7] for a cosmological problem. In ref. [9], it was successfully applied to the cases of the sphere and the circle reobtaining known results [10]-[14] and finding some new ones. Old as the spherical problem may look, it has

been repeatedly revisited in such recent papers as refs. [15, 16]. However, as far as we know, a complete zeta function approach has never been applied to the problem of the cylinder, first studied in ref.[17]. This is precisely what we plan to do in the present work.

The spectral zeta functions, made from some operator's eigenmode set $\{\omega_n\} \equiv \mathcal{M}$, will be called

$$\zeta_{\mathcal{M}}(s) = \sum_n \omega_n^{-s}. \quad (1)$$

Quite often, it is even more convenient to use the dimensionless version $\zeta_{\frac{\mathcal{M}}{\mu}}(s) = \sum_n \left(\frac{\omega_n}{\mu}\right)^{-s}$, where μ is an arbitrary scale with mass dimensions. In most cases of interest, we have to consider spectra of the same sort as that of a free particle, and ω_n grows with n without bound. Therefore, strictly speaking, these identities hold only for $\text{Re } s > s_0$, being s_0 a positive number given by the rightmost pole of $\zeta_{\mathcal{M}}(s)$. Nevertheless, this function admits analytic continuation to other values of s , including the negative reals.

The vacuum energy density ε will be obtained by zeta-regularization of the mode sum $\frac{1}{2} \sum_n \omega_n$ (we have adopted the typical QFT units, i.e., $\hbar = c = 1$). If the result found is not finite yet, one can add a principal part (P) prescription as in ref.[6]. Writing everything together,

$$\varepsilon(\mu) = \text{P} \left[\frac{1}{2} \mu \zeta_{\frac{\mathcal{M}}{\mu}}(s); s \rightarrow -1 \right], \quad (2)$$

where P means extraction of the principal part. Obviously, for this procedure to be operational, we need the analytic continuation of $\zeta_{\mathcal{M}}(s)$ to $s = -1$. In our case, as we have an infinite cylinder, we consider ε as the 'linear' density of energy per length unit.

The present problem can be related to that of a circle in $2 + 1$ dimensions. If $\{\omega_n\} \equiv \mathcal{C}$ denotes the set of all the eigenfrequencies, the complete zeta function for the circle will be $\zeta_{\mathcal{C}}(z) = \sum_{\omega_n \in \mathcal{C}} \omega_n^{-z}$. Given that the ones for the cylinder are $\mathcal{M} = \{\sqrt{\omega_n^2 + k^2}, \omega_n \in \mathcal{C}, k \in \mathbf{R}\}$, the new zeta function will be

$$\zeta_{\mathcal{M}}(s) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dk}{2\pi} \sum_{\omega_n \in \mathcal{C}} \left(\sqrt{\omega_n^2 + k^2} \right)^{-s} = \frac{1}{2\pi} B\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{s-1}{2}\right) \zeta_{\mathcal{C}}(s-1), \quad (3)$$

where B stands for the Euler beta function. Laurent-expanding around $s = -1$ one realizes that

$$\zeta_{\mathcal{M}}(s) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[\frac{\zeta_{\mathcal{C}}(-2)}{s+1} + \left(\ln(2) - \frac{1}{2} \right) \zeta_{\mathcal{C}}(-2) + \zeta'_{\mathcal{C}}(-2) + \mathcal{O}(s+1) \right]. \quad (4)$$

Thus, to determine $\zeta_{\mathcal{M}}(s)$ at $s = -1$ means having to know $\zeta_{\mathcal{C}}(z)$ at and around $z = -2$. For this reason, it is not possible to directly apply the results in ref.[9] for the circle, which only give information about $\zeta_{\mathcal{C}}(z)$ at $z = -1$. The residue of $\zeta_{\mathcal{M}}(s)$ at $s = -1$ is $\zeta_{\mathcal{C}}(-2)$ itself. In fact, it turns out that the sum of the internal and external contributions to this quantity vanishes. This can be anticipated by the parity of the Seeley - de Witt coefficient related to the possible divergence (actually, the same as the coefficient for the scale anomaly of the one-loop energy) and by the fact that we are including the internal and external spaces to an infinitely thin boundary in a globally flat manifold of odd space dimension —see e.g. [6], [8] (pages 107-111), [18] or refs. therein. Such a vanishing means two things:

- First, the whole result is finite and the principal part prescription, as well as the use of the scale μ , are actually unnecessary. Then, (2) reduces to

$$\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}\zeta_{\mathcal{M}}(-1). \quad (5)$$

- Second, the finite value which appears at the end depends only on $\zeta'_{\mathcal{C}}(-2)$, i.e.

$$\zeta_{\mathcal{M}}(s) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\zeta'_{\mathcal{C}}(-2) + \mathcal{O}(s+1). \quad (6)$$

Therefore, to know only the value of $\zeta_{\mathcal{C}}$ at $s = -2$ —without knowing the next term in its Taylor expansion— would be of no help.

The present paper is organized as follows: In the next section we consider the Maxwell equations and how the e.m. problem decomposes into two situations with just scalar fields. Afterwards, the relevant zeta functions are introduced in sec. 3. Then, the energetic contributions of the Dirichlet and Neumann modes are separately found in secs, 4 and 5, respectively. The total result and related comments appear in sec. 6.

Solutions of the Maxwell equations for a cylinder. The eigenfrequency set of an electromagnetic problem is the one dictated by the Maxwell equations under the b.c. in question. Therefore, our first step will be to solve the Maxwell equations. We will look for solutions in cylindrical coordinates of the form

$$E_i, B_j = e^{i\omega t} e^{ikz} e^{im\theta} R(r). \quad (7)$$

We observe that in (7) $\omega > k$, which allows us to boost to a frame in which $k = 0$. In this frame, Maxwells equations read

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{im}{r} B_z &= -i\omega E_r \\ -\frac{\partial B_z}{\partial r} &= i\omega E_\theta \\ \frac{\partial(rB_\theta)}{\partial r} - imB_r &= i\omega r E_z \end{aligned} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \left. \begin{aligned} \frac{im}{r} E_z &= i\omega B_r \\ -\frac{\partial E_z}{\partial r} &= -i\omega B_\theta \\ \frac{\partial(rE_\theta)}{\partial r} - imE_r &= -i\omega r B_z \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (8)$$

In fact, (8) are two decoupled systems of three equations each, which can be solved using well known techniques. Inside the cylinder, after imposing regularity at $r = 0$ (which excludes the Y_m solutions), we find two sets of solutions: The first one is given by

$$B_z = J_m(\omega r), \quad E_r = \frac{m}{\omega r} J_m(\omega r), \quad E_\theta = \frac{i}{\omega} \frac{\partial J_m(\omega r)}{\partial r} \quad (9)$$

while the second one reads

$$E_z = J_m(\omega r), \quad B_r = -\frac{m}{\omega r} J_m(\omega r), \quad B_\theta = -\frac{i}{\omega} \frac{\partial J_m(\omega r)}{\partial r} \quad (10)$$

where we only list the radial parts of the solutions, and the components not listed vanish. Calling $\vec{n}$ the normal vector to the boundary, the b.c. for an infinite and perfectly conducting cylinder of radius a , which read $\vec{n} \cdot \vec{B}|_{r=a} = 0$, $\vec{n} \times \vec{E}|_{r=a} = 0$, imply $E_\theta = E_z = 0$, $B_r = 0$, and, thus, $J'_m(\omega a) = 0$ for (9), and $J_m(\omega a) = 0$ for (10).

In regard to the solutions outside of the cylinder, we have to bear in mind that the Y_m functions are no longer to be ruled out. Thus, we may start by replacing $J_m(\omega r) \rightarrow AJ_m(\omega r) + BY_m(\omega r)$ in (9) and (10). Next, the conditions at infinity impose constraints on A and B . This question has been addressed in some detail in [9] for the sphere, but the same type of calculation may be carried over to the present case. The outcome is that, in practice, everything works out as if the actual combination was $J_m(\omega r) + iY_m(\omega r) = H^{(1)}(\omega r)$ (or its conjugate). Once these solutions have been obtained, one just has to boost back to the original frame.

Summing up, the Maxwell equations for cylindrical waves under perfectly conducting b.c. on an infinite cylinder of radius a have two sets of solutions, corresponding to the transverse electric (TE) and transverse magnetic (TM) modes. TE modes are subject to Dirichlet b.c., and TM modes obey Neumann b.c. Thus, when restricting the problem to the circle, the set of modes may be written as $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{N}$, where $\mathcal{D}$ stands for the Dirichlet modes and $\mathcal{N}$ for the

Neumann modes. These two sets are further subdivided, depending on whether we consider the part of the solution inside or outside of the cylinder. In the first case, we add the requirement of regularity in the interior, while in the second we have to impose physically suitable conditions at infinity. For the internal TE modes (10), the ω 's are such that ωa must be nonvanishing zeros of the Bessel function J_m , i.e.,

$$J_m(\omega a) = 0, \quad m \in \mathbf{Z}, \quad (11)$$

where m is the angular momentum number, while the internal TM eigenfrequencies (9) obey a Neumann condition of the form

$$J'_m(\omega a) = 0, \quad m \in \mathbf{Z}. \quad (12)$$

As for the external modes, and in view of the analytical methods we plan to apply, it is formally enough to replace every Bessel function J_m by a Hankel function $H_m^{(1)}$ (justified by [9]). In consequence, I_m functions should be replaced by K_m functions (See below).

Partial-wave and complete zeta functions. As we have just seen, the e.m. problem can be regarded as the sum of two situations involving a massless scalar field: in the first, it is subject to (11), and, in the second, has to satisfy (12). Let's now consider an adequate formalism for each part.

First, we introduce the 'partial-wave' zeta functions for the modes inside the cylinder (which we shall call 'int' region)

$$\zeta_m^{\text{int}, \mathcal{D}}(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} j_{m,n}^{-s}, \quad \zeta_m^{\text{int}, \mathcal{N}}(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} k_{m,n}^{-s}, \quad \text{for } \text{Re } s > 1, \quad (13)$$

where $j_{m,n}$ is the n th nonvanishing zero of J_m and $k_{m,n}$ means the n th solution of eq. (12), for a given m . The superscripts $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ refer to Dirichlet and Neumann b.c. The analogous functions for the external modes ('ext' region) will be called $\zeta_m^{\text{ext}, \mathcal{D}}(s), \zeta_m^{\text{ext}, \mathcal{N}}(s)$. Looking at the whole problem, we have to take into account the angular degeneracies

$$d(m) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } m = 0, \\ 2, & \text{for } m > 0. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

With them, we define the complete zeta functions for the circle:

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{int},\mathcal{D}}(s) &= a^s \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} d(m) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} j_{m,n}^{-s} = a^s \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} d(m) \zeta_m^{\text{int},\mathcal{D}}(s), \\ \zeta_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{int},\mathcal{N}}(s) &= a^s \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} d(m) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} k_{m,n}^{-s} = a^s \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} d(m) \zeta_m^{\text{int},\mathcal{N}}(s),\end{aligned}\tag{15}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{ext},\mathcal{D}}(s) &= a^s \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} d(m) \zeta_m^{\text{ext},\mathcal{D}}(s), \\ \zeta_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{ext},\mathcal{N}}(s) &= a^s \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} d(m) \zeta_m^{\text{ext},\mathcal{N}}(s).\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

With these ingredients, one builds up the total complete zeta function for the circle, i.e. the one entering eq.(6), which is

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_{\mathcal{C}}(s) &= \zeta_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{int},\mathcal{D}}(s) + \zeta_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{ext},\mathcal{D}}(s) + \zeta_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{int},\mathcal{N}}(s) + \zeta_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{ext},\mathcal{N}}(s) \\ &\equiv \zeta_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{D}}(s) + \zeta_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{N}}(s).\end{aligned}\tag{17}$$

By the methods of ref.[9] the functions (13) have the following integral representations valid for $-1 < \text{Re } s < 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_m^{\text{part, cond}}(s) &= \frac{s}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi s}{2} \int_0^{\infty} dx x^{-s-1} \ln \left[L^{\text{part, cond}}(m, x) \right], \\ \text{part} &\in \{ \text{int, ext} \}, \text{ cond} \in \{ \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{N} \},\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}L^{\text{int},\mathcal{D}}(m, x) &= \sqrt{2\pi x} e^{-x} I_m(x), & L^{\text{int},\mathcal{N}}(m, x) &= \sqrt{2\pi x} e^{-x} I'_m(x), \\ L^{\text{ext},\mathcal{D}}(m, x) &= \sqrt{\frac{2x}{\pi}} e^x K_m(x), & L^{\text{ext},\mathcal{N}}(m, x) &= -\sqrt{\frac{2x}{\pi}} e^x K'_m(x).\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

This is not enough yet, as we must go further to the left, until $s = -2$. In order to extend the domain of validity of these formulas, it suffices to perform an adequate subtraction in the integrand, with the aim of separating the part that causes the divergent behaviour which stops us from reaching $s = -2$. One of the simplest possibilities is to add and subtract functions of the type

$$x^{-s-1} [\mathcal{Y}_1(m)t(x) + \mathcal{Y}_2(m)t^2(x)], \quad t(x) = (1+x^2)^{-1/2}\tag{20}$$

Specifically, we take

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Y}_1^{\text{int},\mathcal{D}}(m) &= -\frac{1}{2} \left(m^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right), & \mathcal{Y}_2^{\text{int},\mathcal{D}}(m) &= -\frac{1}{4} \left(m^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right), \\ \mathcal{Y}_1^{\text{int},\mathcal{N}}(m) &= -\frac{1}{2} \left(m^2 + \frac{3}{4} \right), & \mathcal{Y}_2^{\text{int},\mathcal{N}}(m) &= +\frac{1}{4} \left(m^2 - \frac{3}{4} \right), \\ \mathcal{Y}_1^{\text{ext, cond}}(m) &= -\mathcal{Y}_1^{\text{int, cond}}(m), & \mathcal{Y}_2^{\text{ext, cond}}(m) &= \mathcal{Y}_2^{\text{int, cond}}(m), \quad \text{cond} \in \{ \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{N} \},\end{aligned}\tag{21}$$

and write

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_m^{\text{part, cond}}(s) &= \frac{s}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi s}{2} \\ &\times \left\{ \int_0^\infty dx x^{-s-1} \left[\ln \left[L^{\text{part, cond}}(m, x) \right] - \mathcal{Y}_1^{\text{part, cond}}(m) t(x) - \mathcal{Y}_2^{\text{part, cond}}(m) t^2(x) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathcal{Y}_1^{\text{part, cond}}(m) \frac{1}{2} B\left(\frac{s+1}{2}, -\frac{s}{2}\right) + \mathcal{Y}_2^{\text{part, cond}}(m) \frac{1}{2} B\left(\frac{s+2}{2}, -\frac{s}{2}\right) \right\}, \\ &\text{part} \in \{ \text{int, ext} \}, \text{cond} \in \{ \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{N} \}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Given that all the represented integrands have now the asymptotic behaviour $x^{-s-1} \cdot \mathcal{O}(t^3(x))$, the integrals are finite at $s = -2$. At this point, their specific values do not matter, as they are eventually multiplied by the zero coming from $\sin \frac{\pi s}{2}$. Further, since $\lim_{s \rightarrow -2} \sin \frac{\pi s}{2} B\left(\frac{s+2}{2}, -\frac{s}{2}\right) = -\pi$, all the expressions have a finite limit at $s = -2$. For instance,

$$\zeta_m^{\text{int}, \mathcal{D}}(-2) = -\frac{1}{4} \left(m^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right), \quad \zeta_m^{\text{int}, \mathcal{N}}(-2) = \frac{1}{4} \left(m^2 - \frac{3}{4} \right). \quad (23)$$

The first confirms a previous result in ref.[19], while the other is a new result.

Dirichlet modes. The integral in eq. (22) converges for $s = -2$ and can be obtained numerically. In order to compute the complete ζ functions, (15) and (16), it proves convenient to perform further manipulations. This job has already been done in ref.[9]. Although the relevant ζ functions of that paper were obtained starting from expressions that are valid for $-1 < \text{Re } s < 0$, we can make use of their final expression (eq.(3.22) of ref.[9] with $\sigma_1^{I, \mathcal{D}} = -\sigma_2^{I, \mathcal{D}} = -1$ for the interior modes, and $\sigma_1^{II, \mathcal{D}} = \sigma_2^{II, \mathcal{D}} = -1$ for the exterior modes) provided $N > 2$. Adding the contribution of the internal and external modes, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_m^{\mathcal{D}}(s) &= m^{-s} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{s^2(6+5s)}{128m^2} + \frac{s^2(2+s)(176-268s-452s^2-113s^3)}{98304m^4} \right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{s}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi s}{2} m^{-s} \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{D}}(s, m). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where we have defined

$$\int_0^\infty dx x^{-s-1} \left\{ \ln \left[2m\sqrt{1+x^2} I_m(mx) K_m(mx) \right] - 2 \sum_{2 \leq 2n \leq N} \frac{\mathcal{U}_{2n}^{\mathcal{D}}(t(x))}{m^{2n}} \right\} \equiv \mathcal{S}_N^{\mathcal{D}}(s, m). \quad (25)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_2^{\mathcal{D}}(t) &= \frac{t^2}{16} - \frac{3t^4}{8} + \frac{5t^6}{16}, \\ \mathcal{U}_4^{\mathcal{D}}(t) &= \frac{13t^4}{128} - \frac{71t^6}{32} + \frac{531t^8}{64} - \frac{339t^{10}}{32} + \frac{565t^{12}}{128}, \\ &\vdots \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

In (24) we have chosen $N = 4$. For the coefficients $\mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{D}}(s, m)$ we find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{D}}(-2, 1) &= 1.34757127 \times 10^{-3}, & \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{D}}(-2, 2) &= 2.83382470 \times 10^{-5}, & \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{D}}(-2, 3) &= 2.6944637 \times 10^{-6}, \\ \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{D}}(-2, 4) &= 4.9500306 \times 10^{-7}, & \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{D}}(-2, 5) &= 1.31795554 \times 10^{-7}, & \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{D}}(-2, 6) &= 4.4524310 \times 10^{-8}, \\ \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{D}}(-2, 7) &= 1.7751724 \times 10^{-8}, & \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{D}}(-2, 8) &= 7.99494 \times 10^{-9}, & \dots\end{aligned}\quad (27)$$

When m is large enough, $\mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{D}}(-2, m)$ decreases as m^{-6} , and can be approximated by

$$\mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{D}}(-2, m) = \frac{19}{8960m^6} - \frac{7649}{4730880m^8} + \frac{192349}{82001920m^{10}} - \frac{15293983}{2788065280m^{12}}. \quad (28)$$

In order to construct the complete zeta function, we need the series

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \zeta_m^{\mathcal{D}}(s) &= -\frac{1}{2}\zeta_R(s) - \frac{s^2(6+5s)}{128}\zeta_R(2+s) + \frac{s^2(2+s)(176-268s-452s^2-113s^3)}{98304}\zeta_R(4+s) \\ &\quad + \frac{s}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi s}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^{-s} \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{D}}(s, m),\end{aligned}\quad (29)$$

where the appearance of the Riemann zeta functions ζ_R comes from identifying sums of the type $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^{-z} = \zeta_R(z)$. Observe that, strictly speaking, such identification is only valid if $\text{Re}(z) > 1$. Given that we are analytically continuing expressions involving s , we have to suppose that we may temporarily take s large enough so that this process be valid, before letting $s \rightarrow -2$ at the end. It appears also the series

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^2 \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{D}}(-2, m) = 0.001500509798 \quad (30)$$

Expression (24) is not valid for $m = 0$, since it was obtained from a rescaling $x \rightarrow mx$ and application of uniform asymptotic expansions in mx . However, the $m = 0$ contribution can be easily found by applying formulas (22) and preceding, which yield

$$\zeta_0^{\mathcal{D}}(s) = \zeta_0^{\text{int}, \mathcal{D}}(s) + \zeta_0^{\text{ext}, \mathcal{D}}(s) = -\frac{s}{16} + \frac{s}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi s}{2} \int_0^{\infty} dx x^{-1-s} \left\{ \ln\{2xI_0(x)K_0(x)\} - \frac{1}{8} \frac{1}{1+x^2} \right\}. \quad (31)$$

Numerically, we find

$$\int_0^{\infty} dx x \left\{ \ln\{2xI_0(x)K_0(x)\} - \frac{1}{8} \frac{1}{1+x^2} \right\} = 0.01096298110873 \quad (32)$$

Putting everything in (29)-(32) together, we obtain, for $s \sim -2$,

$$a^s \zeta_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{D}}(s) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} d(m) \zeta_m^{\mathcal{D}}(s) = 0.007725967(s+2) + \mathcal{O}\left((s+2)^2\right), \quad (33)$$

and, therefore,

$$\varepsilon^{\mathcal{D}} = \frac{0.000614794033}{a^2}, \quad (34)$$

where $\varepsilon^{\mathcal{D}}$ means the part of ϵ coming from the contribution of $\zeta_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{D}}$ only, and can be interpreted as the Casimir energy linear density of a scalar field under Dirichlet b.c. on the cylindrical surface. As expected, (34) is free of divergences, which provides us with a nontrivial check of our result. The result in (34) (and (44) and (45) below as well) is the lowest order result, which we expect to be modified by higher order (quantum, finite temperature...) effects.

Neumann modes. The Neumann modes admit a very similar treatment. For the equivalent of (24) we find

$$\zeta_m^{\mathcal{N}}(s) = m^{-s} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{s^2(2+7s)}{128m^2} + \frac{s^2(s+2)(-16+548s+2156s^2+707s^3)}{491520m^4} + \frac{s}{\pi} \sin\left(\frac{\pi s}{2}\right) \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{N}}(s, m) \right\} \quad (35)$$

where we have introduced

$$\int_0^\infty dx x^{-s-1} \left\{ \ln \left[\frac{2m}{\sqrt{1+x^2}} x^2 I'_m(mx) K'_m(mx) \right] - 2 \sum_{2 \leq 2n \leq N} \frac{\mathcal{U}_{2n}^{\mathcal{N}}(t(x))}{m^{2n}} \right\} \equiv \mathcal{S}_N^{\mathcal{N}}(s, m). \quad (36)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_2^{\mathcal{N}}(t) &= -\frac{3t^2}{16} + \frac{5t^4}{8} - \frac{7t^6}{16}, \\ \mathcal{U}_4^{\mathcal{N}}(t) &= -\frac{16}{27t^4} + \frac{109t^6}{32} - \frac{733t^8}{64} + \frac{441t^{10}}{32} - \frac{707t^{12}}{128} \\ &\vdots \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

In order to obtain the complete Neumann ζ function we need the sum

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \zeta_m^{\mathcal{N}}(s) &= \frac{1}{2} \zeta_R(s) + \frac{s^2(2+7s)}{128} \zeta_R(s+2) + \frac{s^2(s+2)(-16+548s+2156s^2+707s^3)}{491520} \zeta_R(s+4) \\ &+ \frac{s}{\pi} \sin\left(\frac{\pi s}{2}\right) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^{-s} \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{N}}(s, m) \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

As we content ourselves with $N = 4$, we will only need $\mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{N}}(-2, m)$. After some calculations, we have obtained:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{N}}(-2, 1) &= -2.3057255 \times 10^{-3}, & \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{N}}(-2, 2) &= -4.755908 \times 10^{-5}, & \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{N}}(-2, 3) &= -4.495047 \times 10^{-6}, \\ \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{N}}(-2, 4) &= -8.2371882 \times 10^{-7}, & \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{N}}(-2, 5) &= -2.1903952 \times 10^{-7}, & \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{N}}(-2, 6) &= -7.3944610 \times 10^{-8}, \\ \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{N}}(-2, 7) &= -2.9468381 \times 10^{-8}, & \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{N}}(-2, 8) &= -1.3267927 \times 10^{-8}, & \dots \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

For sufficiently large m , $\mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{N}}(-2, m)$ can be approximated by

$$\mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{N}}(-2, m) = -\frac{9}{2560m^6} + \frac{1657}{675840m^8} - \frac{494891}{147603456m^{10}} + \frac{10472667}{1394032640m^{12}}, \quad (40)$$

which implies that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^2 \mathcal{S}_4^{\mathcal{N}}(-2, m) = -0.00256191227 \quad (41)$$

Again, (35) is not valid for $m = 0$, which has to be obtained separately:

$$\zeta_0^{\mathcal{N}}(s) = \frac{3s}{16} + \frac{s}{\pi} \sin\left(\frac{\pi s}{2}\right) \int_0^{\infty} x^{-1-s} dx \left\{ \ln[-2xI_0'(x)K_0'(x)] + \frac{3}{8} \frac{1}{1+x^2} \right\}, \quad (42)$$

which for $s \sim -2$ can be approximated by

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_0^{\mathcal{N}}(s) &= \frac{3s}{16} + \frac{s}{\pi} \sin\left(\frac{\pi s}{2}\right) [-0.475214928727027 + \mathcal{O}(s+2)] \\ &= -\frac{3}{8} + \left(\frac{3}{16} - 0.475214928727027\right)(s+2) + \mathcal{O}\left((s+2)^2\right). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Gathering everything together, we find that the contribution of the Neumann modes is

$$\varepsilon^{\mathcal{N}} = -\frac{0.01417613719}{a^2}. \quad (44)$$

which, as expected, is free of divergences. Here $\varepsilon^{\mathcal{N}}$ means the part of ϵ coming from the contribution of $\zeta_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{N}}$ alone. It can be also viewed as the Casimir energy linear density of a scalar field subject Neumann b.c. on the cylindrical surface.

Result and discussion. The total electromagnetic energy per unit of length is given by the sum of (34) and (44), which yields

$$\varepsilon \equiv \varepsilon^{\text{e.m.}} = \epsilon^{\mathcal{D}} + \epsilon^{\mathcal{N}} = -\frac{0.013561343}{a^2} \quad (45)$$

which confirms the result obtained in ref. [17], where a high-frequency cutoff procedure was used, as well as our new results (34) and (44). The result in (45) is negative and indicates an ensuing attractive force. However, only the Neumann modes give a contribution of the same sign as the net result. The part from the Dirichlet modes is two orders of magnitude smaller and has opposite sign. In view of the analogous problem for the circle in $2+1$ dimensions [9], where the e.m. modes reduce to a set of Neumann modes only, this dominance is perhaps not so surprising. Nevertheless, in that case the result was infinite before applying the principal

part prescription (by zeta-function regularization, the type of divergence involved is seen to disappear when the number of space dimensions is odd).

Curiously enough, one of the initial motivations for calculating $\varepsilon^{\text{e.m.}}$ was the conjecture [12] that, being an intermediate situation between the parallel plates (attractive) and the sphere (repulsive), the cylinder might turn out to have $\varepsilon^{\text{e.m.}} = 0$. What we see is that the two contributions to the e.m. energy do indeed have opposite signs, although they fail to cancel each other as the authors of that speculation might have hoped long ago.

In ref.[15] the scalar field under Neumann b.c. was separately studied for the spherical case. Using the figure in that paper (and the ones in previous works for the other cases with a sphere), we can compare the Casimir energy per area unit E_C/A for the sphere and for an infinite cylinder with the same radius (a):

$a^3 \cdot E_C/A$	$\mathcal{D}$ -scalar	$\mathcal{N}$ -scalar	e.m.
cylinder	+0.000098	−0.002256	−0.002158
sphere	+0.000224	−0.017808	+0.003689

Observe that, for the sphere, the e.m. case is *not* $\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{N}$ because, in the presence of that surface, it decomposes into Dirichlet plus some special form of Robin—not Neumann—modes. Actually, the ratio between the $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ contributions to the cylinder is $-0.043\dots$. In the spherical case, the ratio of ‘ $\mathcal{D}$ to $\mathcal{N}$ ’ has the value of $-0.012\dots$, which has the same sign and order of magnitude, but is nearly four times smaller. Note that, in the case of the parallel plates, this ratio is $+1$. Comparing the e.m. results alone, the sphere has almost twice the absolute value of the cylinder. At any rate, since the energy for the cylinder is lower, the Casimir effect might tend to deform conducting spherical bubbles into cylindrical tubes. In a ‘foam-like’ universe model, one could even imagine a bubble becoming very thin in some directions and very long in another, as was conjectured in ref.[5].

Regarding the two parts as separate results for scalar fields under different b.c., we observe that a change in the nature of the conditions can produce a drastic alteration, in size and sign, of the vacuum energy. Thus, the Casimir effect for a scalar field under Dirichlet b.c. would tend to expand the cylinder, but, after changing them into Neumann b.c., the effect would tend to make the cylinder contract. This is, too, the tendency of the e.m. field, as was duly pointed out by the authors of ref.[17]. In the same paper, they also said: *Still eluding us*

is the physical intuition to predict Casimir attraction or repulsion. Seventeen years later, the truth of this remark seems to hold on.

Acknowledgements. A.R. is grateful to *Generalitat de Catalunya —Comissionat per a Universitats i Recerca* for financial support to make a stay, in summer 1997, in Dept of Physics and Astronomy, University of Oklahoma (1996BEAI300119), where some of the ideas in this paper were conceived. Thanks are also due to R. Kantowski and to K.A. Milton himself, for the discussions which took place there. S. Leseduarte is kindly thanked for bibliographic help.

References

- [1] H.B.G. Casimir, *Proc. Kon. Ned. Akad. Wetenschap* **51** (1948) 793; M.J. Sparnaay, *Physica* **24** (1958) 751; S.K. Lamoreaux, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78** (1997) 5; G. Plunien, B. Müller and W. Greiner, *Phys. Rep.* **134** (1986) 87; L. Spruch, *Science* **272** (1996) 1452.
- [2] P.W. Milonni, R.J. Cook and M.E. Goggin, *Phys. Rev.* **A 38** (1988) 1621.
- [3] K.A. Milton and Y.J. Ng, *Phys. Rev.* **E 57** (1998) 5504.
- [4] L.S. Brown and G.J. MacLay, *Phys. Rev.* **184** (1969) 1272; A. Salam and J. Strathdee, *Nucl. Phys.* **B90** (1975) 203; J.S. Dowker and R. Critchley, *Phys. Rev.* **D 13** (1976) 3224; S.W. Hawking, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **55** (1978) 133; R. Kantowski and K.A. Milton, *Phys. Rev.* **D36** (1987) 3712.
- [5] J. Ambjørn and S. Wolfram, *Ann. Phys.* **147** (1983) 1.
- [6] S.K. Blau, M. Visser and A. Wipf, *Nucl. Phys.* **B310** (1988) 163.
- [7] A.O. Barvinsky, A. Yu. Kamenshchik and I.P. Karmazin, *Ann. Phys.* **219** (1992) 201.
- [8] E. Elizalde, S.D. Odintsov, A. Romeo, A.A. Bytsenko and S. Zerbini, *Zeta Regularization Techniques with Applications*, World. Sci. (1994).
- [9] S. Leseduarte and A. Romeo, *Ann. Phys.* (N.Y.) **250** (1996) 448.

- [10] T.H. Boyer, *Phys. Rev.* **174** (1968) 174.
- [11] K.A. Milton, L.L. DeRaad Jr., and J. Schwinger, *Ann. Phys.* (N.Y.) **115** (1978) 388.
- [12] R. Balian and B. Duplantier, *Ann. Phys.* (N.Y.) **112** (1978) 165.
- [13] C.M. Bender and K.A. Milton, *Phys. Rev.* **D 50** (1994) 6547.
- [14] K.A. Milton and Y.J. Ng, *Phys. Rev.* **D 46** (1992) 842.
- [15] V.V. Nesterenko and I.G. Pirozhenko, *Phys. Rev.* **D57** (1997) 1284.
- [16] M.E. Bowers and C.R. Hagen, hep-th/9806193.
- [17] L.L. DeRaad Jr. and K.A. Milton, *Ann. Phys.* (N.Y.) **136** (1981) 229.
- [18] C.G. Beneventano and E.M. Santangelo, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A11** (1996) 1871.
- [19] S. Leseduardte and A. Romeo, *J. Phys.* **A 27** (1993) 2409.
- [20] M. Abramowitz and I.A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, Dover Publ., NY (1970).